REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner has rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,225,901 to Kail (Kail) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,233,492 to Nakamura (Nakamura).

Claim 1

Kail and Nakamura do not teach or make obvious all elements of claim 1, even in combination. Specifically, Kail does not disclose transmitting a command to get a reportable specification to a sensor, or transmitting a reportable specification message from a sensor.

Claim 1 has been amended to specifically recite that the reportable specification message informs the process module computing system of the type of data that will be provided from the first sensor. This is supported on page 8, lines 17-19 of the application. The Examiner in paper number 12, paragraph 41, states that all data may be classified as a "type" of data and that it would be obvious to transmit a data type, and that it would be obvious that the prior art would transmit a "type" of data, since if the sensor didn't send a "type" of data the system would not be able to understand what is being read from the sensors. Page 2, lines 3-17, of the application explains that in the prior art, drivers were created for a sensor. The driver would specify the data type from the sensor. The disadvantage of the use of drivers is that if a sensor did not have a driver for a particular operating system, the sensor could not be used. Since the driver specified the data type, a data type would not need to be sent from the sensor. For this reason, it is not obvious to send a reportable specification message specifying data type from the sensor.

For at least these reasons, claim 1 is not made obvious by Kail in view of Nakamura.

The Examiner has rejected claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kail in view of Nakamura in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,510,350 to Steen, III et al. (Steen) in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,204,768 to Kosugi (Kosugi).

Claim 2

Claim 2 depends from claim 1, and is therefore patentable for at least the reasons discussed above in relation to claim 1. Additionally, Kail, Nakamura, Steen and Kosugi do not teach or suggest all elements of claim 2, even in combination. Specifically, Kosugi does not disclose transmitting an acknowledgement of a reportable specification message, which informs the process module computing system of the type of data that will be provided from the first sensor.

Kosugi teaches a fire monitoring system and fire sensor in which a receiver 100 is in communication with sensors 102 (Col. 5:63-6:2). However, the receiver 100 never transmits an acknowledgement of a reportable specification message to the sensors 102. The only acknowledgement signal transmitted to the sensors 102 is sent in the context of mode-switching, not reportable specifications that inform the process module computing system of the type of data that will be provided from the first sensor. For at least these reasons, claim 2 is not made obvious by the cited references.

The Examiner has rejected claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kail in view of Nakamura in further view of Steen in further view of Kosugi in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,535,123 to Sandelman et al. (Sandelman).

Claim 3

Claim 3 depends from claim 2, and is therefore patentable for at least the reasons discussed above in relation to claims 1 and 2. Additionally, claim 3 has been amended to specifically recite that the alarm table designates the number of alarms, alarm identification numbers, and descriptions of the alarms. This is supported on page 7, line 31, to page 8, line 3, of the application. In response to the Examiner's comments in paragraph 47 of paper number 12, claim 3 as amended specifically states what is in the alarm table. Kail, Nakamura, Steen, Kosugi, and Sandelman do not teach or make obvious all elements of claim 3, even in combination. Specifically, Sandelman does not disclose transmitting an alarm table to a sensor. The cited section of Sandelman col. 3, lines 20-65, and col. 8, line 53, to col. 9, line 15 discloses providing an exception condition, but does not disclose or suggest transmitting an alarm table. Claim 3, as amended, recites that the Alarm Table provides alarm identification numbers and a

description of the alarms. Sandelman does not teach sending such a table to a sensor. For at least these reasons, claim 3 is not made obvious by Kail, Nakamura, Steen, Kosugi, and Sandelman.

The Examiner has rejected claims 4-9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kail in view of Nakamura in further view of Steen in further view of Kosugi in further view of Sandelman in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,301,122 to Halpern (Halpern).

Claim 4-9

Claims 4-9 each depend either directly or indirectly from the dependent claim 3, and are therefore respectfully submitted to be patentable over the art of record for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 3. Additionally, these dependent claims require additional elements that when taken in the context of the claimed invention, further patentably distinguish the art of record. For at least these reasons, claims 4-9 are not made obvious by Kail, Nakamura, Steen, Kosugi, Sandelman and Halpern.

Applicants believe that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully request a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

<div align="right">
Respectfully submitted,
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP

Michael Lee
Reg. No. 31,486
</div>

P.O. Box 778
Berkeley, CA 94704-0778
(650) 961-8300